

came across Professor Fernald's note on this species from the "Connecticut Coast" by H. S. Clark (RHODORA 24: 204). I was consequently pleased to find in my own collection a very fine specimen of *P. altissima* L. from Nantucket, originally in the herbarium of Fred G. Floyd, which I bought in 1921. The specifications are "Edge of cultivated field, abundant; near Hummock Pond; June 7, 1906; F. G. Floyd, no. 2334." I took the sheet to the Gray Herbarium and made careful comparison with the European sheets and modern European floras. There is no better or more robust specimen in the Gray Herbarium than this one from Nantucket. Unfortunately a search through Mr. Floyd's unmounted duplicates fails to reveal another.—LUDLOW GRISCOM, Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University.

VALIDITY OF THE NAME LESPEDEZA¹

B. P. G. HOCHREUTINER

I have read with great interest the article of P. L. Ricker concerning the Leguminose genus *Lespedeza*. I take now the liberty of expressing an opinion because I have been appointed by the International Nomenclature Commission to make the French version of the Rules which Dr. Briquet, former Rapporteur général, unfortunately could not elaborate.

That is why I want to say that I fully agree with Mr. Ricker when he "hopes that no overenthusiastic botanist will seize this case as an opportunity to make a new name or corrections sufficiently different in appearance to think he is entitled to place his name after all of the new combinations thus involved."

Unhappily, the Art. 70 of the new Rules is as follows: "the original spelling of a name must be retained except in the case of a typographic error or a clearly unintentional orthographic error."

Therefore, if things stand as Ricker states, any botanist is entitled: 1) to correct *Lespedeza* to begin with *Ces*; 2) to change *Cespedesia* (Ochnaceae) to some other name because it would be so similar to the altered *Lespedeza* that it creates confusion (Art. 70, paragraph 3) as the editors of *Rhodora* correctly remark in the last foot note. These changes in the generic names would involve of course changes in specific combinations.

¹ Apropos an article of P. L. Ricker, RHODORA, xxxvi, 130-132 (1934).

Therefore, I consider that the publication of Ricker is particularly unfortunate, as it will call the attention of the "over-enthusiastic botanists" to a fact which they would have always ignored.

Now, I believe I am keeping the spirit of Briquet if I study the case, in order to prevent as far as possible changes in nomenclature. To stop such superfluous changes, there would be, of course, one method: a proposition to the Nomenclature Commission and a decision of a congress to add *Lespedeza* to the list of the *nomina utique conservanda* (Art. 21, note 1).

However, until the decision is taken, the "*over-enthusiastics*" will have published perhaps the new combinations and it may be useful to prevent it. That is why I venture to propose the following explanation, which is in perfect legal accordance with the Rules.

I note first the *Recommandation XXX* of the Vienna Rules: "The liberty of making orthographic corrections must be used with reserve, especially if the change affects the first syllable and above all the first letter of a name." That was the *article* 66 of the Paris laws, and it is very much to be regretted that so wise an advice was left out (although not contradicted) in the last edition of Cambridge.

But that is common sense and even if common sense is not enforced by law it still retains its authority.

Secondly, I must remind the reader that Ricker showed that the governor of Florida, in honour of whom the genus *Lespedeza* was named, bears a name which is written differently in various documents: V. M. de Céspedes or V. M. de Zéspedes (*cf.* footnote of Ricker, p. 131).

Further, we must remark that in pure Spanish, C and Z, followed by an *e* are pronounced like the English *th*, a sound which it is impossible to transcribe in Latin.

Therefore, it is impossible to assume with absolute certainty that Michaux or the publishers, Richard or Michaux's son, did not *deliberately* alter the name and write it with an L, in order to meet French euphony.¹ Of course, one may *suppose* that it is due to an error of a copyist, but I wish to emphasize the fact that the slightest doubt prevents a correction, even on the ground of the new Cambridge Rules, in which the somewhat unusual expression, "only *unintentional orthographic errors* may be corrected" is used.

¹ The proof that elder naturalists changed often and deliberately letters in names on account of euphony or of special pronunciations can be found in the very same instance because Michaux wrote *Lespedeza* with a *z* in the second part of the word as *Cespedes* or *Zespedes* is always written with an *s* at the end. No doubt Michaux did so deliberately because he wanted to express in latin the very strong pronunciation by the Spaniards of the letter *s*.

Dr. Rendle, one of the most distinguished members of the International Nomenclature Commission, interprets that in saying that there *may be intentional orthographic errors*, i. e. orthographical changes deliberately adopted by the author, and these cannot be modified.

Now, if there is a case in which a so-called intentional error may be considered, it is this one, because the author of the name *Lespedeza* could not possibly guess how it should be written. It is so much the more obvious that if an "over-enthusiastic" botanist would correct it to-day, it would be quite impossible, because he would not know how. If he corrects it to begin with *Ces*, he will be unable to prevent another from correcting it to begin with *Zes*, *Thes*, or even *Fes* to satisfy the Portuguese pronunciation. We would have thus five valid names for the same thing, a very queer consequence of "overenthusiasm" in botany.

We conclude, therefore, that nobody is entitled to alter the name *Lespedeza* and, consequently, the well-known Ochnaceous name *Cespedesia* remains also perfectly valid.

BOTANICAL GARDEN AND MUSEUM,
Geneva.

DRABA IN TEMPERATE NORTHEASTERN AMERICA

M. L. FERNALD

(Concluded from page 371)

LIST OF EXSICCATAE CITED

Abbe, E. C.

- 371 glabella Pursh
- 372 nivalis Liljebl.
- 374 crassifolia Graham
- 375 fladnizensis Wulfen, var.
heterotricha (Lindbl.) Ball
- 376 fladnizensis Wulfen, var.
heterotricha (Lindbl.) Ball
- 377 nivalis Liljebl.
- 378 nivalis Liljebl.
- 379 fladnizensis Wulfen, var.,
heterotricha (Lindbl.) Ball
- 380 fladnizensis Wulfen, var.
heterotricha (Lindbl.) Ball
- 381 fladnizensis Wulfen, var.
heterotricha (Lindbl.) Ball
- 383 nivalis Liljebl.
- 384 fladnizensis Wulfen, var.
heterotricha (Lindbl.) Ball
- 385 rupestris R. Br.
- 386 fladnizensis Wulfen, var.
heterotricha (Lindbl.) Ball

- 387 fladnizensis Wulfen, var.
heterotricha (Lindbl.) Ball
- 1261 glabella Pursh, var. megas-
perma (Fernald &
Knowlt.) Fernald
- 1262 norvegica Gunner

Abbe & Brooks

- 364 glabella Pursh
- 365 glabella Pursh
- 366 norvegica Gunner
- 367 glabella Pursh
- 368 norvegica Gunner

Abbe & Hogg

- 369 nivalis Liljebl.

Abbe, Hogg & Forbes

- 370 incana L., var. confusa
(Ehrh.) Liljebl.